



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,142	02/06/2004	Mayuko Yoshida	60811 (49381)	8256
21874 7590 06/13/2008 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205				
EXAMINER				
PARK, CHAN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/13/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/774,142

**Applicant(s)**

YOSHIDA ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHAN S. PARK

**Art Unit**

2625

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 3/11/08, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 10-18** are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 10-13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0095284 in view of Keane et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0215525 (hereinafter Keane).

**With respect to claim 10**, Parry discloses a data processing apparatus (imaging device 110 in fig. 1), comprising:

a data input unit for inputting data (input unit for receiving print jobs from the source 160 in paragraph 13, lines 5-7);

a data storage unit including a first storage section (first directory for storing the files according to the file type in paragraphs 18 & 23) and a second storage section for storing the input data (second directory for storing the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23);

an outputting unit configured to perform output processing on the input data (printing the data by the imaging device 110 in paragraph 23);

a data control unit configured to distribute the input data to either the first storage section or the second storage section depending on a property of the input data (note that processor is acting as the memory controller for distributing the translated files to appropriate directories according to the user-defined operations in paragraphs 18 & 23); and

a data delete control unit configured to delete the stored input data in the second storage section, set a deletion condition of the stored input data in the second storage section, and control deletion of the stored input data in the second storage section based on the deletion condition.

Parry, however, does not explicitly disclose a data control unit for transferring the stored input data from the first storage section to the second storage section.

Parry discloses the image device 110 having a control panel for accessing/managing the directories/files (paragraphs 20 and 23). The examiner takes an Official Notice that moving a stored file from one directory to another directory using a conventional drag and drop method is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to implement

Art Unit: 2625

the drag and drop method to transfer the stored input data from the first storage to the second storage. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method of modifying/managing directory contents by moving files from one location to another.

Parry, however, further does not explicitly disclose a data delete control unit configured to delete the stored input data in the second storage section, set a deletion condition of the stored input data in the second storage section, and control deletion of the stored input data in the second storage section based on the deletion condition.

Keane, the same field of endeavor of retaining files/print jobs in the directory, discloses a condition setting means for setting retention condition or a deletion condition of the file (the number of days to keep the file in the database in paragraph 120 & fig. 28) and deleting the files according to the set condition (paragraph 120 & fig. 28).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of setting the retention and/or deletion condition as taught by Keane into the printing system of Parry.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to manage the stored files/print jobs and to prevent from retaining the old files/print jobs for a long time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Parry with Keane to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

**With respect to claim 11**, Parry discloses the data processing apparatus, wherein the data control unit distributes the input data having the property of

confidentiality (PIN) to the second storage section (second directory for storing the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 28).

**With respect to claim 12**, the combination discloses the data processing apparatus of claim 11, further comprising:

a confidentiality setting section for setting the input data as confidential (the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23 of Parry) wherein the deletion condition is set in each data job when the input data is set to be confidential (the number of days to keep the file in the database in paragraph 120 & fig. 28).

**With respect to claim 13**, the combination discloses the data processing apparatus of claim 12, further comprising:

a date inputting section for inputting the number of days as the deletion condition;  
and

a calendar detecting section for detecting the date corresponding to the inputted date, wherein the stored input data in the second storage section is deleted when the date corresponding to the inputted date is detected (paragraph 120 & fig. 28 of Keane).

Keane, however, does not explicitly disclose the date inputting means for inputting a date as the deletion condition of said data.

However, since designating a specific date via a GUI is well known technique in the art, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inputting means of Keane to reflect the date inputting display.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide another way to specify the deletion date of the said data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

**With respect to claim 18**, Parry discloses a data processing apparatus, wherein the data control unit is a memory controller connected to said first storage section and said second storage section (note that processor is acting as the memory controller for distributing the translated files to appropriate directories according to the user-defined operations in paragraphs 18 & 23).

4. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parry and Keane as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Rice U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174010.

**With respect to claim 14**, Parry discloses the data processing apparatus according to claim 11, comprising: confidentiality setting means for setting said data to be confidential (the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23). Note that these files are set to be confidential at the printer since the files can only be retrieved upon user entering the PIN codes (paragraph 22).

Parry, however, does not explicitly disclose the determination level inputting means for inputting a determination level depending on the level of the secrecy or importance of said data when said data is set to be confidential.

Rice, the same field of endeavor of retaining files in the directory for later access, discloses the determination level inputting means for inputting a determination level

depending on the level of the secrecy or importance of directory (setting different security classification for each directory in paragraph 133).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the setting the security level to the directory as taught by Rice into the printing system of Parry.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to regulate the directory access via the web server 120 (paragraph 20 of Parry) depending on the security level.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Parry with Rice to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

**With respect to claim 15**, the combination discloses a condition setting means for setting retention condition or a deletion condition of the file and automatically deleting the stored input data when deletion condition is satisfied (the number of days to keep the file in the database in paragraph 120 & fig. 28 of Keane), wherein the determination level is classified into a plurality of classes, and each of the classes is used as the deletion condition (paragraph 133 of Rice).

**With respect to claim 16**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13, are applicable.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. **Claim 17** is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.



***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **CHAN S. PARK** whose telephone number is (571)272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHAN S PARK/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625  
/Edward L. Coles/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

June 6, 2008